

Novice

Parli

Elims

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Novice

Arts 246

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

~~Evergreen U.~~ Notre Dame

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE ~~Notre Dame~~

POS	School: <u>Notre Dame</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Czarina V.P.</u>		
	Speaker: <u>Divya Nekkanti</u>		

NEGATIVE ~~Evergreen~~

POS	School: <u>Evergreen</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Anh Diep</u>		
	Speaker: <u>Priya Bhattacharya</u>		

The better debating was done by the NEG from Evergreen
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: GMA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

In Round

Novice SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Evergreen & Notre Dame
11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Arts 246

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: <u>Notre Dame</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Czarina Yip</u>	_____	_____
2	Speaker: <u>Divya Nekkanti</u>	_____	_____

NEGATIVE

POS	School: <u>Evergreen</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Anh Diep</u>	_____	_____
2	Speaker: <u>Priga Bhattacharyee</u>	_____	_____

The better debating was done by the NEG from Evergreen
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Nancy Frobrade

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD in Round.

Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Parliamentary

WIM ELIM Finals

Novice

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Arts 246

Evergreen v Notre Dame
11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE NOTRE DAME

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Carolina JP</u>		
	Speaker: <u>Dmya</u>		

NEGATIVE EVERGREEN

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Anh Diep</u>		
	Speaker: <u>Priya</u>		

The better debating was done by the NEG from EVERGREEN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Carolina

AD

RFD:

In Round

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD SJ (Ryan Seideman & Anna Johnson) vs. Everg DB (Anh Diep & Priya Bhattacharjee)

AFFIRMATIVE

Everg DB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

~~scribble~~ BisODSJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the APP from Everg DB
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Although the probability for the impacts are ridiculously low, the neg did not give me enough warrants attacking its solvency for me to have been able to vote, especially since the APP declared impacts inevitable which was not contested.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Everg DB (Anh Diep & Priya Bhattacharjee) vs. BisOD SJ (Ryan Seideman & Anna Johnson)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Everg DB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

BisOD SJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Everg
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Andy [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Everg DB (Anh Diep & Priya Bhattacharjee) vs. BisOD SJ (Ryan Seideman & Anna Johnson)

AFFIRMATIVE

EVERGREEN DB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

BISHOP O'DOWD SJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from BISHOP O'DOWD SJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I DON'T THINK APP CAN ACCESS NUCLEAR IMPACTS.
NEG POINTS OUT APP LACK OF SOLID PLAN.
I BUY THE NEG ARG THAT GREENE AS RECTOR
SHOULD BE WEIGHED IN THE NET BENEFIT EQUATION.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

NotDam YN (Czarina Yip & Divya Nikkanti) vs. BisO'D PD (Kendall Post & Bryce Dewitt)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Notre Dame

Bishop & Dowd

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Notre Dame
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Amrison P.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Draft

I vote Aff because the neg advocacy was unclear + they still had ~~ref~~ access to court since you dropped all their refutations.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D PD (Kendall Post & Bryce Dewitt) vs. NotDam YN (Czarina Yip & Divya Nikkanti)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE



NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

ADD
AFF or NEG

from

Notre Dame
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Flight A

QUAR

Mavany, Muna

Glenn, Kelsey

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

DiaVal JY (Paul Jeon & Brandon Ye) vs. BisOD SJ (Ryan Seideman & Anna Johnson)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


DiaVal JY

BisOD SJ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bis OD SJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- * Affirmative action was banned in CA public schools several years ago... how was CA protesting it last year? * ← (NOT RFD)
- * Asians are not a majority. They are an over-represented minority (ORM) vs opposed to an under-represented minority (URM) like Blacks & Hispanics. * ← (not RFD)
- * The Bakke vs. Regents decision was a bit misrepresented, it didn't find A.A. explicitly constitutional, just quota systems unconstitutional. * ← (not RFD)
- * AFF concedes constitutionality FW analysis, precedent examples + doesn't deal w/ NC analysis in any way except extending the AC through ink * ← (RFD)

Room: Oconnor 206
Flight: Start ASAP
Novice Parliamentary

Flight A

QUAR

Hinojoza, Justin

~~Bond, SUZANH~~

↳ is lazy

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD SJ (Ryan Seideman & Anna Johnson) vs. DiaVal JY (Paul Jeon & Brandon Ye)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

DiaVal JY

BisOD SJ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

~~Aff~~ Neg

from

BisOD SJ

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- affirmative action = institutionalized racism
↳ what?
- CBS 65% oppose A.A.
↳ I'm skeptical of this statistic
- CI: ↑ disc for neg.
- CI: neg. dir. of
- CI: Undines = + civil rights amendment
- CI: History suppress its side
- Paul!
- When you concede that A.A. erases (st) past inequalities you're really hurting yourself.
- ↳ also probably best of to say things like "Asian culture is harder working"
↳ sounds pretty racist
- ↳ also empirically false since not all asian ethnicities perform equally well
↳ ie Phillipino/Vietnamese/Cambodians/etc. would likely benefit from A.A.

- need to explain arguments more in depth
- Paul, slow down you become very nervous & flustered. Take deep breaths and talk at a conversational pace

- In conceding that A.A. can/has corrected for past discrimination the ~~aff~~ more or less hands the round to the ~~aff~~ ^{negative} by strengthening the 14th amendment = protection argument made by the ~~aff~~ neg

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

DiaVal JY (Paul Jeon & Brandon Ye) vs. BisOD SJ (Ryan Seideman & Anna Johnson)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

DIA. VAL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

BISHOP O'DONN

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG. from BISHOP O'D SJ.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: David J. Seideman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RULED FOR BISOD BECAUSE THEY POINTED OUT PRECEDENT SETTING CASES THAT RULED IN FAVOR OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, AND THAT THE NEG. ONLY POINTED OUT DIFFIENCES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION NOT ANYTHING THAT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Room: Oconnor ~~204~~ 206
Flight A: Start ASAP Flight B
Novice Parliamentary

QUAR

Zhang, Yiru


SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

NO SHOW
SumPrep IG (Liam Isaacs & Nathaniel Griffin) vs. Everg DB (Anh Diep & Priya Bhattacharjee)

AFFIRMATIVE



NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from _____
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

EVERGREEN WAS
ACTUALLY HERE

Room: ~~Oconnor 204~~ 206
Flight A: Start ASAP Flight B
Novice Parliamentary

QUAR

~~Takeuchi, Kayok~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

SumPrep IG (Liam Isaacs & Nathaniel Griffin) vs. Everg DB (Anh Diep & Priya Bhattacharjee)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Sum Prep IG

Everg DB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the N/A from Everg DB
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No Show

EvergDB was present

Room: Oconnor ~~207~~
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice Parliamentary

Flight B
201

QUAR

~~4, Evergreen~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD CM (Shawn Cunningham & Hailey McKenna) vs. NotDam YN (Czarina Yip & Divya Nikkanti)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NotDam YN

BisOD CM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from BisOD CM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Government: You stated that Obamacare was not free but your counter plan was. I would have liked to see what your CP was in greater detail. Opp did not harp on this but your 1st speech said funding via "normal means" — Normal means assumes taxpayers — which means by comparison your CP is more expensive than Obamacare.

Also do not blanket assume the life of 18 year olds.

Opposition: There needed to be more said regarding the costs, I heard \$212B, \$2T Clarification was needed.

RFD: Government you never really made a pitch that your CP overrules Obamacare. Essentially both were the same and thus the Opp wins They provided more reasons why healthcare is good. Your response to Contention #3 was also generalized — the truth is that 26 y.o. can be on parental care.

Opp VI #2, #3

Room: Oconnor ²⁰¹ ~~207~~
Flight ~~Start~~ ASAP
Novice Parliamentary

Flight B

QUAR

~~3, Evergreen~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD CM (Shawn Cunningham & Hailey McKenna) vs. NotDam YN (Czarina Yip & Divya Nikkanti)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Divya Nikkanti & Czarina Yip
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Shawn Cunningham & Hailey McKenna
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

U.S. Federal Government should repeal Obamacare.

The better debating was done by the AFF from NotDam YN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Igorio Boytchev Jr. Job

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It was a close call. The aff team contradicted themselves and made blunders, but the negative team made twice as many blunders as the aff side. The winning argument came down to the fact that the neg team claimed that the savings due to Obamacare would amount to 212 billion dollars, but did not mention implementation costs, and did not mention where they got their statistics from. The Aff side caught that and successfully attacked it. The Neg team never defended it, and ultimately scored a loss.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

NotDam YN (Czarina Yip & Divya Nikkanti) vs. BisOD CM (Shawn Cunningham & Hailey McKenna)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Czarina & Divya
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Shawn & Hailey
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

WHY we should repeal US Obama Care

The better debating was done by the AFF from Not Dam YN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① Both teams made some good points about The benefits of Obama Care vs. Cost & burden on The country
- ② AFF team spent a lot of time defending a counter plan - which was not relevant or necessary to do. Their burden is only to prove that Obama care is not a good plan.
- ③ NEG team did not clearly spend a lot of time "counteracting" the counterplan strategy, but they should have spent more time refuting cost for the nation & affordability
- ④ I picked ~~AFF~~ because their points (cost factor & affordability) are both strong & valid & the other team did not refute it with substantive data. (I am ignoring AFF counterplan - it had no bearing on my decision)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D PD (Kendall Post & Bryce Dewitt) vs. Saratoga CP (Sabrina Chen & Sonal Pai)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Sabrina Chen and Sonal Pai
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Kendall Post and Bryce Dewitt
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Topic: Supreme court should rule voter IDs laws unconstitutional.

The better debating was done by the Neg from BisO'D PD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Tchernio Boytchev Jr. JB

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative team made good arguments why voter ID laws are not unconstitutional. They do not infringe on people's freedom's to vote, while they do control for voter fraud, such as deceased people having their names used as legitimate votes. The affirmative team made an argument that it is costly for some people to obtain IDs. The negative team defeated that argument by demonstrating that a lot of people have IDs used for many other reasons (driving, airports, government buildings, courtrooms, etc.) that the inconvenience is not that large and that the benefits outweigh the costs, and inconveniences. Neg side marginally won. Aff delivery was very nervous and with much stuttering and unnecessary pauses.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D PD (Kendall Post & Bryce Dewitt) vs. Saratoga CP (Sabrina Chen & Sonal Pai)

AFFIRMATIVE

Saratoga CP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Bishop O'D PD

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bishop O'Dowd PD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: AD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neither team did an adequate job of referencing back to the criterion — on point however this is something handled by SCOTUS. SCOTUS as you know interprets law, does not create policy. Hence we have a fact debate. ~~Gov~~ ^{opp} did not adequately extend this however — this was not mentioned in voters.

RFD: The opp was correct about the fact case — I'm voting on issue #2, #3 (10 needed for everything, Crawford v Marlon) because on fact voter ID is constitutional. Gov, if ruled a fact debate had a chance on sociological arguments but I felt did not impact deeply enough. You also didn't tell me why voting is moral.

Good Job ! ☺

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D PD (Kendall Post & Bryce Dewitt) vs. Saratoga CP (Sabrina Chen & Sonal Pai)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Sabrina / Sonal

Bryce / Kendall

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Supreme Court should rule vote ID rules Unconstitutional

The better debating was done by the

AFF
NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Saratoga CP
BisO'D PD
BisO'D PD
Saratoga CP

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① AFF team presenting some compelling points - cost, complexity, etc
- ② NEG team presented more legibly with some evidence of supreme court case & issued prevention
- ③ Both teams did a good job of rebuttals, ~~but did not~~
- ④ Both teams repeated the same points
- ⑤ AFF team was a bit nervous - ~~and did not~~
- ⑥ AFF team rebuttal of Crawford vs. Marion? Indiana case (Supreme court) was called out to be incorrect, but the team repeated that rebuttal.
- ⑦ AFF team had more compelling data points (11% without voter IDs, 18% seniors without voter IDs etc, which factually would make such a strong case - but they have not capitalised on those points), ~~they did not~~ ^{they did} ~~make~~ ^{make} ~~the~~ ^{fact} they did convey that voter IDs is more restrictive than ~~that~~ ^{found}
- ⑧ Neg team did not have a strong evidence to rebut that.
- ⑨ It's a close call, but I voted for AFF because they presented more evidence on the restrictiveness of ~~the~~ this policy a why it rule against voter IDs - and overall had more compelling points.